



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,831	03/04/2004	Daniel Ledermann	250031US2	3854
22850 7590 10/28/2009 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER THOMAS, JASON M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2423				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/791,831

Applicant(s)

LEDERMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Thomas

Art Unit

2423

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/791,831.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1- 3, 5-8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al., CA 2,321,462 (hereinafter Jones) in view of Fingerman et al., U.S. Pat. No. 7,143,430 B1 (hereinafter Fingerman), Yoshimine et al., 6,963,898 B2 (hereinafter Yoshimine) and Hasegawa et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0015992 A1 (hereinafter Hasegawa).

Regarding claim 1: Jones discloses a system for recording and playback of television signals from a plurality of television channels, comprising:

a computer-based controlling central unit, connectible to as telecommunication network (see [fig. 2 item 40], [abstract], [pg. 3, ll. 12-21], [pg. 7, ll. 23-25], [pg. 8, ll. 6-12], [pg. 26, ll. 25-27] for a central controlling server);

a plurality of television receivers, connected to the controlling central unit, for receiving television signals in each case on one of the television channels

[see [fig. 2], [abstract], [pg. 4, ll. 3-5], [pg. 7, ll. 27-29], [pg. 9, ll. 15-17], [pg. 11, ll. 5-8], [pg. 23, ll. 17-19] where digital video equipment such as satellite dishes and receivers are used to gather and distribute data);

one or more coding modules, connected to the television receivers, for coding the received television signals in a digital format (see [abstract], [pg. 3, ll. 12-19], see also [pg. 6, ll. 7-12], [pg. 7-8, ll. 27-4] for a unit that behaves as a receiver, receiving multimedia/television/internet signals and coding the signals);

and a playback module configured to transmit the television signals stored in the digital format via the telecommunication network for playback on a terminal of the user, who is identified by the user identification assigned to the respective stored television signals (see [pg. 3, ll. 21-26], [pg. 8, ll. 26-30], [pg. 9, ll. 9-13], [pg. 11, ll. 5-17], [pg. 12, ll. 15-17]).

While Jones teaches a controlling central unit he is silent regarding an instruction unit connected to the controlling central unit, configured to receive and store recording instructions from users via the telecommunication network, the recording instructions including a user identification of a mobile terminal, a channel number, and recording timing and configured to instruct the controlling central unit to select and store the television signals, in the digital format based on the recording instructions including, information on a television channel specified by the channel number and the recording timing and configured to assign the user identification to the selected television signals.

Furthermore Jones does not teach wherein a display terminal is associated to the user, the display terminal being identified by a network address that is linked to the user identification assigned to the respective stored television signals of a user database.

Fingerman teaches an instruction unit which is connected to a controlling unit (see [fig. 2]) which receives and stores recording instructions including a user identification, channel number, and timing information (see [fig. 4] - [fig. 6]), such that it instructs the controlling unit to select and store signals based on the received information which is stored (see [col. 9, ll. 6-44]) but is silent regarding a user identification of mobile terminal.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include some capability to store recording instructions and then to execute those instructions to record programming, as taught by Fingerman, when providing a system used to provide users with the ability to designate programs to record, as taught by Jones, because such information which is to record a program at a future time must be stored in order to be recalled to record a program prior to its scheduled start time (see [col. 9, ll. 22-26]).

Yoshimine teaches a device and system for storing media on a content providing system where a portable information terminal or mobile telephone can be used to access said media based on entering user identification of said mobile terminal (see [col. 7, ll. 16-25], [col. 14, ll. 31-46], [col. 15, ll. 8-33], [cols. 37-38, ll.

60-6]). Yoshimine also teaches where a display terminal is associated to the user and identified by a network address that is also linked to the user id and assigned to the media content stored on the content providing system (see [cols. 8-9, ll. 45-3], [col. 9, ll. 19-28], [col. 10, ll. 26-33], [col. 15, ll. 8-13], [cols. 37-38, ll. 60-6]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the means of controlling and accessing a stored recording by enabling the recording to be accessed via a mobile terminal and controlled based on an association with a user id and network address as taught by Yoshimine in order to provide alternative and mobile means to access media for users who are not able to access a stationary terminal and additional security for exclusive control.

In the amendment entered July 16, 2009, Applicant added limitations directed to a system storage unit (see pg. 8 of Remarks) and placed the limitations of said storage unit in claim 1. The following addresses these added limitations:

Hasegawa teaches a system for recording broadcast program material at the request of a user and using storage units to store programming material together with the ID of the user who has made the reservation (see [55]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multimedia system, as taught by Jones, by providing storage units and storing programming together with user ID's, as taught by Hasegawa, in order to provide an alternate shared means of

recording content and keeping track of which recording belongs to which user (see [1, 6-7]).

Regarding claim 2: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the controlling central unit is configured to transmit, in accordance with the stored recording instructions, control signals to one of the connected television receivers for activation of the respective television receiver and/or for selection of a television channel on the respective television receiver based on the channel number (see Jones [pg. 13, ll. 13-23] for an inherent control signal directing the STB to receive data on local storage in accordance with the stored recording instructions; see also Jones [pg. 17, ll. 18-25], [pg. 25-26, ll. 23-23], [pg. 22, ll. 22-28]; see also Fingerman [fig. 6], [col. 9, ll. 13-44]).

Regarding claim 3: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the telecommunication network is a network based on Internet protocol, and the playback module is set-up-further configured to transmit the television signals, stored in the digital format, in streaming mode via the telecommunication network to the display terminal associated with the user (see Jones [pg. 1, ll. 5-10], [pg. 7, ll. 1-11], [pg. 9, ll. 15-22], [pg. 13, ll. 20-23], [pg. 22-23, ll. 22-7]; see also Fingerman [fig. 1] ; see also Yoshimine [cols. 8-9, ll. 45-3], [col. 9, ll. 19-28], [col. 10, ll. 26-33], [col. 15, ll. 8-13], [cols. 37-38, ll. 60-6] for a display terminal that is associated to the

user and identified by a network address that is also linked to the user id and assigned to the media content stored on the content providing system).

Regarding claim 5: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the playback module is configured to transmit the television signals, stored in the digital format, via the telecommunication network to the display terminal associated with the user depending upon quality parameters of the terminal of the respective user (see Fingerman [col. 3, ll. 22-26] where the data rate, a form or quality parameter is indicated by the client's request; see also

Regarding claim 6: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the controlling central unit includes stored television program information, and in that-the controlling central unit is further configured to receive from users as recording instructions via the telecommunication network identification data for telecasts and, in accordance with the received identification data, to store recording instructions, based on the stored television program information, with indications about television channel and telecast identification and/or starting time/ending time or respectively duration (see Fingerman [fig. 4], [fig. 6], [col. 9, ll. 22-47] for a system which uses information received from the user regarding a program to be recorded to, at a later time, record the program designated by the information received prior to the program broadcast).

Regarding claim 7: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to transmit, after successful storing of the television signals, in accordance with the stored recording instructions, an electronic ready message via the telecommunication network to the mobile terminal of the user whose user identification is assigned to the respective recording instructions (see Fingerman [cols. 3-4, ll. 66-5] for an electronic ready message; see Yoshimine [cols. 37-38, ll. 60-6] for a mobile terminal).

Regarding claim 8: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to erase automatically television signals, after a defined period of time after their storage, and in that the controlling central unit is set up to transmit automatically, before the automatic erasing, an electronic warning signal via the telecommunication network to the mobile terminal of the user whose user identification is assigned to the respective stored television signals (see Fingerman [fig. 8], [col. 10, ll. 33-41] for automatically erasing and an electronic warning; see Yoshimine [cols. 37-38, ll. 60-6] for a mobile terminal).

Regarding claim 10: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the television receivers are configured to receive digital and/or analog television signals via cable television networks and/or via television antennas for terrestrial television broadcasting or satellite television transmission, and the controlling central unit and the playback

module are each implemented on different computers connected to one another, the controlling central unit and/or the playback unit including memories for storing the television signals coded in the digital format (see Fingerman [col. 5, ll. 12-18], [col. 9, ll. 27-44] for receiving video signals via various paths such as a cable network and for storing the captured signals to memories).

Regarding claim 11: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach wherein the plurality of television receivers and the plurality of coding modules are configured to receive and record television signals from different channels in parallel at the same time for two different users from said users (see Fingerman [fig. 2], [fig. 13], [cols. 4-5, ll. 59-18] for receiving multiple signals in simultaneously in parallel for the various users of the system).

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine, Hasegawa, Perlman, U.S. Pre- Grant Pub. No. 2002/0184637 A1 (hereinafter Perlman) and Merrill Solomon, 2003/0070174 A1 (hereinafter Solomon).

Regarding claim 4: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, do not teach wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to encrypt the television signals, coded in the digital format, with a cryptographic prior to their storage, wherein the system further comprises: an access control module configured to generate access rights to the television signals, stored in the digital format, and configured to

transmit the generated access rights, comprising the respective cryptographic keys, via the telecommunication network to authorized users only, and wherein the playback module is further configured to receive access rights from users via the telecommunication network and, in accordance with the received access rights, to transmit the encrypted television signals, stored in the digital format, to the respective user.

Perlman teaches an encryption system which encrypts a video signal prior to storage (see [57], [59]), an access control module configured to generate access rights which are transmitted via the network to authorized users (see [58]), and a playback module for transmitting the encrypted data to the user (see [61]).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art provide a means of encryption and decryption, as taught in Perlman, when providing a means to transmitting video across a network as instructed by users, as taught in Jones, because this prevents unauthorized users from viewing video content (see [57]).

Solomon teaches a system where only authorized users are able to receive access to transmitted display content on the terminal of said authorized user (see [40], [65], [73]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of providing access by limiting access only to the display terminals of users who are authorized as

taught by Solomon in order to provide security and privacy to the users who have decided to receive and view particular content.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine, Hasegawa and Ellis et al., U.S. Pre- Grant Pub. No. 2003/0149988 A1 (hereinafter Ellis).

Regarding claim 9: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, do not teach wherein the controlling central unit is further configured to store only once, jointly assigned to the user identifications of the respective plurality of users, television signals, which have been received at a time and on a television channel which are identified through consistent recording instructions from a plurality of users.

Ellis teaches the concept of a media server which stores a single copy of a program for multiple clients to simultaneously play back after being recorded (see [fig. 6a], [20], [90-96]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to only store a single copy which can be used to provide access to multiple users, as taught in Ellis, when providing a storage server to record media to be viewed at a later time, as taught in Jones, because this saves the amount of storage space used for multiple of users by reducing the amount of duplicate media to be saved by each user.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine, Hasegawa and Slotznick, U.S. Pat. No. 7,058,356 B2 (hereinafter Slotznick).

Regarding claim 12: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, teach sending an electronic message in the form of an email to a client but do not teach wherein the ready message is a short message sent to a mobile device by the users.

Slotznick teaches a mobile (terminal) device (see [fig. 1c]) which can receive transmissions such as e-mail and internet access (see [cols. 15-16, ll. 63-9]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a mobile (terminal) device capable of receiving messages, as taught in Slotznick, when providing a means of communicating through e-mail messages to media users of such a device, as taught in Fingerman, because this allow the viewer to be notified of the completion of a recording when the user is remotely located with respect to their viewing device (see [abstract]).

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine, Hasegawa, and Mensch, U.S. Pre- Grant Pub. No. 2002/0133824 A1 (hereinafter Mensch).

Regarding claim 13: The combined teachings of Jones, in view of Fingerman, Yoshimine and Hasegawa, do not teach wherein the instruction unit

is further configured to extract the user identification of the mobile terminal by using at least one of an international mobile subscriber identity IMSI or a call number.

Mensch teaches wherein a customer can be identified by the cell phone from which they call (see [16], [18]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use identifying information from a mobile device, as taught in Mensch, to extract and identify a user to properly process the user's record request, as taught in Fingerma, because there is sufficient information necessary to identify a person requesting entertainment in mobile devices with unique numbers such as a cell phone (see [16]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 270-5080. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. Thomas

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423